No. 338

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

25th May, 1949

NEWS LETTER

THE NEWS-LETTER CLOSES DOWN

SUPPLEMENT

THE EMERGENCE OF ISRAEL
BY
JAMES PARKES

IT IS WITH THE UTMOST REGRET that we inform our readers that the Christian Frontier Council has reached the conclusion that the Christian News-Letter must cease publication. We know that this announcement will cause pain to many of our readers, as it has done to those who who have found themselves compelled to take this decision. We feel, therefore, that we owe the fullest explanation of the necessity of this step to those who have supported us till now with a loyalty for which we cannot be too grateful.

The reason for closing down can be summed up in one sentence: the available man-power is insufficient for the work to be done. This has been the case over a very long period, and has given the Christian Frontier Council grave concern. Now that the editor is compelled to take a prolonged rest, it is no longer possible to prevent this fact of insufficient man-power from exacting its full toll, and the News-Letter will cease publication with the issue of July 6th.

We have no wish to burden our readers with a long story of the efforts and difficulties of the past years, but it is not possible to bring to an end an enterprise which, not in our own estimation but in that of others, has counted for something in the Christian cause in our day, without giving some account of our stewardship.

The proposal to start the Christian News-Letter took shape in conversations between Dr. Oldham, Archbishop Lang, and Archbishop Temple (then Archbishop of York)

in the first week of the second world war. Other Church leaders were consulted and warmly supported the new venture, and it was launched under the auspices of the Council on the Christian Faith and the Common Life, one of the ecumenical predecessors of the British Council of Churches. The first issue appeared on 18th October, 1939. The main aim was, in face of the catastrophe which had fallen on men and raised in many minds the deepest questionings about human life and destiny, " to pool our available resources of Christian understanding and insight ".

There was never any question who should edit the new journal. Dr. Oldham alone had the gifts and experience necessary for the task. He had been for years one of the inner circle of leaders in ecumenical work; his brilliant partnership with the great American missionary statesman, John R. Mott, brought to success the Edinburgh Missionary Conference of 1910, out of which was born the International Missionary Council, which in turn was the cradle of the World Council of Churches. His whole outlook and interest were directed outwards from the Church, the inner fellowship, to the world, the Church's field of action, and this outlook dominated his masterly organization of the Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State in 1937, his wide reading, and his writings. Yet even he boggled at the thought of a weekly News-Letter published over his name, and was overborne by the protagonists of the personal signature on the ground that the function of the one pen was to give cohesion and continuity to an undertaking which would rest on the thought and work of many. That has always been the position, so much so that when Dr. Oldham retired from the editorship in 1945 there was a ready-made context into which the then assistant editor could fit.

The tasks which the News-Letter set out to perform and the place which it came to occupy can perhaps best be seen in the light of the whole ecumenical movement. The News-Letter has never been either an official publication of the Churches or a purely private venture. It has been free to range where it liked, and to look at the activities of the Churches in the world from its own standing-ground. On the other hand, it was the deliberate desire of Church leaders

to see such an independent journal created as an integral part of a new move (for which the Council on the Christian Faith and the Common Life was founded after the Oxford Conference) to build bridges between the Christian faith and the organized Churches on the one hand and the political, social, and economic life, thought and institutions of the modern world, on the other. The Churches in this country took this project seriously enough to vote, in all their Assemblies, for a staff of six men and appropriate funds for the venture. The outbreak of the war made the enlistment of staff impossible, more especially as the nature of the work would demand a considerable proportion of laymen. The pattern was later re-shuffled. The Churches turned to a new effort at closer working and created the British Council of Churches, a turn of events of the greatest importance when viewed in the wide context of the later foundation of the World Council of Churches.

The News-Letter encouraged and supported by Church leaders and a large body of laymen was, by 1941, firmly on its feet and able to tackle at least some of the tasks which a larger staff might have performed. The first years of work showed how many were the opportunities for a real engagement between Christian thought and secular thought, by bringing about a living exchange between persons of diverse outlooks. Rigid categories were breaking down and conversations were becoming possible which would help to bring Christian thinking out into a large field. There were, too, stirrings among Christian men and women immersed in secular duties, anxious to examine their secular callings as the vehicles of their faith in a new way. The Frontier Council was founded and flourished under the initiative and drive of F. C. Maxwell. The News-Letter played an important part in keeping open slender lines of communication between Christians here and in occupied, and even enemy territory. After the war its staff took a full share in ecumenical work, and it has a large body of readers on the continent who will miss it acutely. Dr. Visser 't Hooft recently called it "Britain's ecumenical voice".

William Temple once said of the News-Letter that it " kept the ferment going ", and, if it did, that was because it had vigorous life going on around it. On the one hand, there was a small group of friends who called themselves " the Moot ". Some day the story of this group will have to be told. After the Oxford Conference, Dr. Oldham drew together a dozen men of widely different intellectual and personal gifts, into a permanent fellowship. The original members included, among others, Mr. T. S. Eliot, the late Professor Karl Mannheim, Professor H. A. Hodges, Professor John Baillie, Sir Fred Clarke, Sir Walter Moberly, Mr. Christopher Dawson and Mr. Middleton Murry ; new names were added as time went on. The debt of the News-Letter to the lengthy papers they wrote for their week-end meetings, to their voluminous correspondence and to their remarkable secretary, Eric Fenn, is quite incalculable. After ten years of productive work the group reached its term and came to an end.

The contribution of the Christian Frontier Council to the News-Letter has been equally great, though mainly in other fields. It has fed into the News-Letter a wealth of experience and knowledge in many ranges of secular life. For example, when the 1944 Education Act was under discussion, the Frontier drew together groups of educationists and industrialists and a long series of lively exchanges took place on many aspects of the proposed bill. Mr. R. A. Butler, then Minister of Education, said of the News-Letter shortly after the passing of the Act, " You have to read the C.N-L. —it 's a source." He could not have said this if there had not been work of the kind described going on behind the scenes. The same was true in relation to a number of other public issues : Christian men and women at work in these spheres in their daily lives have come together from time to time in the Frontier Council and its subsidiary groups and the results of their exchanges have fed the C.N-L. Even so, we have only been able to achieve the standard we have aimed at in a small minority of News-Letters.

Two points have to be made about this kind of work. One is that it is constantly going out of date. A Frontier discussion about housing which took place three years ago

may contain references to some basic principles which are of value to-day, but all the facts, and many of the judgements on priorities, will have been rendered out of date by the passage of time. The work has to be *continuous* to be effective. Secondly, the greatest contribution of knowledge can be made by those who have the least time to spare. This difficulty can be surmounted if there is a Frontier staff, and a staff of the right kind. They can make half an hour of a busy man's time do the work of two hours, and provide for the News-Letter an ever-widening contact with what is going on in society at large. This can be done by quietly moving about making friends, drawing them into the Frontier enterprise, helping them in contact with each other to discuss their practical problems in the light of their faith and to enrich their faith as they do so. A combination of sound theological insight, a listening ear and a capacity to see things from the layman's point of view are prime essentials. Such men and women are not common.

On a cool calculation of our resources we should have closed down the News-Letter at the end of 1947, when the Frontier was reduced to a staff of one and rising costs were causing the News-Letter to live on reserves. We decided, however, to make an act of faith. The Christian Frontier Council symbolized this by raising from among its thirty members a Guarantee Fund of £1,000. The editor, with this encouragement, consented to carry on for an experimental year. The price of the News-Letter had to be raised, and we knew that this increased charge would bear heavily on our readers. The year 1948 closed with a balanced budget, 7,221 subscribers (and very many more readers !) and many indications of support, of which the most encouraging was the offer by Dr. Vidler of part-time help. But it was clear that the only hope of recovery would be the appearance of a full-time man with the qualifications we have outlined. Lack of staff has left the News-Letter during the past eighteen months without a steady expansion of contacts, and without the work of any *new* groups of laymen gathered together by the Frontier.

We hope that this exposition of the inner condition of the News-Letter will show our readers how and why we have

reached the decision to close down. No doubt it could continue for some time in some form, but soon readers would be asking themselves what they were getting from it which they could not get elsewhere—in other words they would detect the lack of creative activity behind it. The world and the Churches are littered with institutions which carry on in a residual form when the real life has gone out of them and their best work is finished. We believe that, as for persons, so for institutions, obedience to the universal rule of death is the only condition of new life. Having made the utmost effort in our power to provide the News-Letter with the conditions of renewing its life, and being unable to do so, we accept the alternative, not with any resentment, but in gratitude to God for the opportunities of service which have been given to the News-Letter in its time.

THE SUPPLEMENT

A long review of Dr. James Parkes's latest book, *A History of Palestine*, from A.D. 135 to modern times, in the current number of *The Times Literary Supplement* says of the author, " He is a scholar and he is also a partisan. . . . His sympathy for Zionism equips him with an understanding of the forces that have made the movement so powerful in feeling and in action." We hope that the reading of his Supplement will send some of our readers to his book.

Kathleen Bliss

P.S. Enclosed with this Letter is a claim form for the repayment of the unexpired portions of subscriptions. If your subscription falls due before July 6th, or if it is paid by somebody else, no claim is being sent to you. Prompt application would greatly help us in the heavy office work involved in winding up the C.N-L. The News-Letter staff will disband on June 30th. Arrangements will be made to deal with claims from overseas subscribers after that date.

Any unclaimed subscriptions will be very gratefully received as contributions to the work of the Christian Frontier Council.

THE EMERGENCE OF ISRAEL

By JAMES PARKES

THE problem which Israel presents us brings to a climax doubts which have existed since the issue of the Balfour Declaration, and is easy to state. It is this: are we to make the best of a successful act of injustice and aggression, because it cannot be undone; and is our duty, especially as Christians, to bend all our efforts to protecting its innocent victims? Or: has Israel a moral justification for its existence in the midst of the Arab world, so that our duty is to help to overcome the bitterness which its coming has created and which war has accentuated; so that the Arab world shall be brought to accept it, and co-operate with it to their mutual advantage? The general attitude of the government, the press, and the pronouncements of many ecclesiastical pundits, indicate without doubt that the first alternative is that generally accepted. I believe the second is the right choice.

At bottom the difficulty throughout has been that the case for Israel is unique, that it cannot be stated by analogies, and that it requires for its understanding an intimate knowledge both of the Jewish question and the history of Palestine.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Israel is not simply the product of a fanatical, partisan and modern nationalism. It has four deep historical roots, all of which will play their part in the future development of the State and its relationships with the land and with the Jewish people throughout the world.

i. Throughout their dispersion the Jews have remained a single people, what the modern world calls a nation, even though it was a unique people geographically scattered through a thousand ghettoes in three continents. Only a small minority, and in the last hundred years, have come to think of themselves as one of many religious denominations, sharing the full rights of many different citizenships.

ii. Except for this small minority, Jews could not corporately enjoy more than second-class status, or individually be more than second-class citizens, because of conditions they had no power to change. Up to the advent of modern nation-states, they all lived within the frontiers of Christendom or Islam, and neither religion granted them equality. That position was not essentially altered in the modern world, even though their social and political treatment improved in many parts. They have never had an opportunity to lose themselves and their memories of the Promised Land, either by complete absorption or by building elsewhere their own new Jewish state.

iii. Their consciousness of being a people was ultimately based on religion, and their religion was inextricably bound up with their past in Palestine. Even if we reject supernatural religion altogether, we should still have to accept it that they were a people whose folk-ways and traditions were intimately and continuously linked with Palestine.

iv. This link has involved continuity of residence; and though the numbers were sometimes only a few thousand, it was always felt throughout Jewry to be symbolical, and was constantly replenished through immigration. Moreover, at the four moments in Jewish history since A.D. 135 when an epoch has ended in complete breakdown, it has been from Palestine that a fresh start has come.

The basis of Jewish survival in dispersion was hammered out in Galilee between the second and fourth centuries.

When the breakdown of the Abbasid caliphate in the ninth century led to the closing of the great Babylonian Jewish schools, Jerusalem occupied the centre of the picture for an obscure century before Jewish life took fresh impetus in Fustat (Cairo) and Spain.

When medieval Jewish life in Europe came to an end with the expulsion from Spain, Safad for a few decades in the sixteenth century was the capital of the Jewish world; and within a stone's throw of each other Joseph Caro composed in the Shulhan Aruch the basis of modern Jewish Orthodoxy and Isaac Luria laid the foundations of the messianic mysticism which sustained the

Jewish masses of eastern Europe through the misery of the succeeding centuries.

When the flight from Russia began in 1881 and anti-semitism raised its head all through Europe, the infant Zionist movement and the first feeble colonies played a vital part in the restoration of Jewish morale, even though only a minute part of the refugees went to Palestine.

What the hope of Israel meant in the D.P. camps of 1945 need not be stressed.

The settlement after the first world war attempted to do justice to a situation which could not be fairly determined along the lines of contemporary majorities and minorities. It is the custom now to sneer at this effort or to denounce it. But its failure was largely due to factors which could not have been taken into account by the original planners for the simple reason that they did not then exist—the indifference of Christendom, the sterile fanaticism of Arab nationalism, and the desperate situation of the Jews in Europe. It was hoped that slowly and gradually a bi-national state would emerge, which could be given independence, and in which Christian interests would be safeguarded. When it became apparent that this could not happen, partition was the next best solution, and, though not in the way planned, partition has taken place.

A full picture of Palestine would, of course, include also the story of Muslim and Christian interests. Here it is necessary to say only that in so far as the present " Arab " population are descendants of the much more numerous population at the time of the Arab conquest, they consist entirely of ex-Christians and ex-Jews, none of whom were " Arabs ". That a hundred years ago the Jews had dwindled to ten thousand (hardly any of whom could have traced a descent back to the seventh century) and the Christians to four or five times that number, out of a total population of about half a million, was due to a process which is very oddly described as kindliness and hospitality. But that does not alter the fact that the majority of the population have been Arabic speaking Muslims for many centuries, and that both they and the native Christians have identified themselves in modern times with the Arab movement.

Even though Jews have a historic claim, we should recognize with sympathy the position of the ordinary Arab villager and townsman, who, knowing no history, could not understand why he should be treated differently from his fellows in other Arab lands. It added one more to the complications of the uniqueness of Palestine that a solution, based on existing majorities and minorities, which would have been normal elsewhere, could only have resulted in injustice here. It is a real tragedy that those Arab moderates who sincerely offered the fullest paper guarantees for the fair treatment of a Jewish minority and the Christian Holy Places, should in fact have been offering something not in their power to guarantee, and which all the available evidence showed to be inadequate to the point of worthlessness. For Christians were everywhere being treated with increasing intolerance by Islam, and Jews had had experience of minority status from states with a less fanatical religion and more political experience than an Arab Palestine could offer, and it was impossible to ask them to repeat the experience.

If we condemn the decisions of the Royal Commission of 1937 and of the United Nations, we must recognize that any other solution would have been as drastic and as problem-making. The alternatives are not a Jewish state on one side, and, on the other, a willing return to the position of Jewry throughout the world in 1933, coupled with an unfree minority in Palestine, progressing, static, or retrogressing, according to the tempo permitted by an Arab-dominated government. We Gentiles have not experienced in our own souls and bodies the life of Jewry since modern anti-semitism dawned seventy years ago. We have not to mourn nearly two-fifths of our people dead. These things do not breed patience, passivity, and moderation; and the miracle is that terrorism made so few converts, and that the recent elections in Israel so decisively defeated the advocates of intransigence and expansionism.

A state of Israel has come into existence. Though it has a formal and legal foundation in the decision of the United Nations, yet its real bases are history and necessity, inspiring the courage and endurance of its own citizens on the field of battle, when it fought alone on all its frontiers invaders from six countries.

History may yet rank its resistance with that of the British in 1940 as a turning point in human society. Military victory may ensure its chance of survival; but only by its approach to the problems of peace will it win an enduring place among the nations. And the problems which confront it would daunt any people, however experienced. But, once we accept that Israel has a moral right to exist, we can do much to help, if only by understanding these problems.

THE PROBLEM OF DUAL LOYALTIES

The only satisfactory definition of a Jew is that he is a man who in some measure inherits and transmits the peculiar values of the civilization created by Judaism. By this definition it is evident that Jews in Britain and elsewhere share in the historical relationships with Palestine as much as those who are citizens of Israel. It is only a small minority which has definitely rejected the Palestinian emphases of Jewish history in so far as it concerns the present and future; and the immense mass of the Jewish people cannot help recognizing a special relationship to Israel, going beyond the friendliest feelings for an outsider. In a peaceful society and under normal conditions this special emphasis would raise no problems. It would be perfectly consistent with the deepest loyalty to the states of which Jews are severally citizens. In so far as principle is concerned, both Jewish organizations and individuals have made sincere declarations of their recognition of a distinction of loyalties. But Euripides reminds us that "the tongue has sworn: the heart cannot be bound by oath"; and in the present troubled waters of world politics, and in view of the strategic position of Israel in the Middle East, there are many who are tempted to regard their Jewish fellow-citizens as potentially vipers in our bosom. But all sense of proportion is lost if we do not recognize that modern national policies are made up from the pressures and tensions of innumerable dual loyalties. At worst the new situation of Jewish citizens merely adds one to a large number. But if we look further we can say that only those dual loyalties are "viperish" which are secret, or at least plan in secret. Big business cartels on one side and communists on the other may have "viperish" characteristics because we do not know what goes on in the Board Room or at the Kremlin. The issues which may confront Jewish citizens are likely to be

publicly recognizable and publicly fought out. They may cause great personal anguish, but that is not the same as a public menace. I find it difficult to foresee a totalitarian Israel conducting secret plots. That is not the Jewish genius.

ISRAEL AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY

Some will claim that Zionist activity in America is a clear example of a country being thwarted from following her own proper interests, in relation not only to Britain, but also to the Muslim world. Apart from the fact that we may come to be very grateful that American recognition helped Israel to resist the temptation to rely entirely on the Communist bloc, it is illogical to refuse to see that Jewish interests and opinions are entitled to be one among the many factors out of which a nation's policy is evolved. When it comes to our own relations with Islam and the Middle East, there is no need to question that good relations in these fields are as much desired by our Jewish citizens as any others. But how is this to be achieved ? Sooner or later we shall have to give up using the Jews as a scapegoat to enable us to evade reshaping a policy which has for long been a conspicuous failure, entirely apart from any Jewish question. Jews have not caused our twenty-five years' tension with Egypt. Jews had nothing to do with France's failure in Syria or ours in Iraq. And, in so far as the Muslim world is concerned, Jews have little to do with an increasing fanaticism which is menacing, not merely Jewish minorities, but all Christian Churches, native as well as foreign, in Muslim countries.

I do not think that we could claim that Jewish interests have been conspicuous in our policy or in the tone and attitude of our public pronouncements ; or that we have done anything to bridge the present gulf between Israel and the Arab world. In fact we have too often distorted the facts themselves to support Arab extremism. But, for the Arabs' own sakes, a change is desperately needed, if the Middle East is not to collapse under the weight of Arab poverty, corruption and incompetence. None of our actions have faced the area's real needs ; but if we once set ourselves to helping in the real problems of the Middle East, Israel could be, as it desires to be, our best ally.

To those outside, including many Jewish citizens of the West, the central question in the emergence of Israel is: What constitutes a *Jewish* state? Is it a theocracy? Will it have two categories of citizenship? It is doubtful whether to the majority of Israeli this problem exists. For them a Jewish state is obviously a state the bulk of whose citizens are Jews, and whose laws are made by those citizens. They are quite prepared to accept the modern separation of Church and State, and equally willing to give full equality to minorities; and they are not at all willing to be dictated to by the Religious Bloc, except on certain elementary matters like the Sabbath as the public day of rest. They are proud of the social traditions of their people; eager to develop them still further along modern lines; deeply convinced of their ability to manage their own affairs with efficiency and justice; and with a strong emphasis on the thought that they can now be "just like any other people".

This attitude has already expressed itself in the fact that Arabs voted freely in the elections, that the Arab Christians within the state have an almost privileged position, and that Christian and Muslim Holy Places have been respected. There have, of course, been unhappy incidents. But they have been few and they have certainly not expressed official policy. But before toleration can be said to have determined the lines of development of the new state, it is going to have to come to terms with two very serious challenges.

The challenge of Orthodoxy to the non-observant Jew is going to arise immediately. For the Religious Bloc participates in the government, and possesses two portfolios of key importance to their claims: immigration and the interior. I do not know how far they will go, for they are, after all, a minority party. But I think it is probably inevitable that they will do their best to repeat the mistakes of their peers and predecessors in many countries and centuries—the Puritans in England under Cromwell, the Calvinists in Geneva, the Prohibitionists in America. They are rigid and narrow—and they have no political experience, especially as a large proportion of their voting strength comes from oriental Jewry.

I believe Orthodoxy will recover the flexibility and sensitivity which marked rabbinic Judaism in its creative centuries. But there will be bitter conflicts before that happens, and probably the emergence of new religious forms. At present liberal Judaism plays almost no part in Israeli life; and the only alternatives are Orthodoxy or an unorganized, often incoherent, sense of religious destiny, coupled with a deep religious humility, much more widespread than the apparent cock-sureness and secularism of the mass of the population would suggest. The change will come, because the genius of Judaism inevitably thrusts upon the Orthodox direct political activity; it can retreat into no ivory tower and it cannot easily adopt political compromises. It will fight for its rigidity until it finds a spiritual basis of change.

In the meantime Israel is likely to be tolerant towards all minorities except towards those Jews who are Christians by religion. This paradox is only understandable through knowledge of a long and very unhappy history, which has caused this hostility to be shared by many who are religiously indifferent. But the feeling has been sharpened by the lamentable effect created by almost all the witnesses from purely Christian bodies at the public sittings of the Anglo-American Committee. This means that continued pressure from those particular sources could do nothing but embitter still further the position of these Christian Jews. It is only as a change towards Israel is observable among Christians, that they are likely to be able to mediate between the Christian Jews and their Jewish brethren.

THE ARAB REFUGEES

On no subject is a fresh approach more desirable than this. About half of the " refugees " consist of the unfortunate population of those parts of Palestine allotted to an Arab state. The Arabs refused to make any attempt to set up an administration when the British left; and these territories were overrun by the most disorderly of the Arab invaders—the riff-raff collected by the Mufti to begin with. It is their behaviour, and the lack of any public order, not Jewish action, which has reduced to destitution a population which, in 1945, was for the first time in centuries clear of debt. For the high prices during the war brought them handsome profits. Moreover, of the Arabs who left the areas held by the Jews more than a third left with all their

ossessions (especially from the towns) under British auspices
nd many of these are now established in neighbouring Arab
tates. Had we recognized these facts more openly we would
ave had more weight when we challenged the Jews with the
ıture of the four hundred thousand whose flight could be
ttributed to their action.

The overwhelming majority of Jews were deeply shocked by
he Irgun massacre of Deir Yassin; but Jewish consideration
vould have been more easily won for the refugees in general, had
t not been for two factors. There is in the first place the cam-
›aign waged by the British press, which has presented a very
listorted picture; and the demands made by churchmen and
›thers that they should instantly be received back, while fighting
vas still in progress, demands which appeared more motivated
›y political venom than by humanitarian interests, since they
were obviously incapable of fulfilment; and there were parallel
ıtrocities, distortions, and exploitation on the side of Arab
›oliticians. In the second place the ordinary Israeli knows that
Europe sanctioned the expulsions of very much larger numbers
›f Germans who had lived for centuries in Poland, Bohemia, and
Transylvania; and the grounds of these expulsions were very
similar to those which made him prepared to accept the *fait accompli* of the Arabs having left, largely of their own volition.
It is idle to expect him to be moved by the world calling them
" peaceful peasants ", for he knows what they were exultantly
promising him they would do to him and his womenfolk in 1940
when the Germans appeared to be winning, and what they did
on many occasions in previous decades. While their hardness
is natural, it is saddening, for two wrongs will never make a
right. I think a real change of attitude on our side towards Israel
might have an effect. At least the Israeli government, while
insisting that the discussion of this question must form part of
a general settlement, has announced that it has no intention of
expropriating abandoned property without compensation. If the
United Nations and the Arab states put forward a sound scheme
of resettlement, I believe there could be generous Israeli co-
operation. For their knowledge of mass settlement is great, and
they both need and desire the co-operation of the Arab world,
and recognize that the settlement of the refugees is an essential
preliminary.

JERUSALEM

There is no question but that Israel will not voluntarily give up the modern city of Jerusalem and the road which links it to the coast. Even before the British left the hundred thousand Jews who lived in it were enduring the rigours of a siege, whose hardships were accentuated by the fact that Jerusalem has no local water supply. It is not surprising that they have no intention of seeing that calamity repeated. On the other hand, the Israeli government has repeatedly said that Israel has no desire to possess the old city or the Holy Places. Incidentally any religious building does not become a " Holy Place " because it was erected in the nineteenth century in Jerusalem. The government attitude is supported by most Jews, though it causes some hesitation to the Orthodox. While they are unlikely to be willing to take the initiative in making any pronouncement explicitly giving up the site of the Temple, I doubt if they would take any positive action to counter the government's attitude.

It is in regard to the future of Jerusalem that Christian responsibility is most obvious, and that the pronouncements made by leading Christians have been most unsatisfactory. They have been political, not religious ; but as Christians we are not called on to decide boundaries between the old city and the new, or even questions of sovereignty at all. Our real concern is this. Is the Christian Jerusalem of to-morrow to be the sordid centre of quarrelling sects and tawdry shrines which it has been in the past and still is, or is it to be a city whence a Christian voice is to take its share in fulfilling the words of the prophet that out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of God from Jerusalem ? Is it to be a centre where a new understanding of the purposes of God grows between Christianity, Judaism, and Islam ? But it is of fundamental importance whether we approach this task accepting Israel as an ally or opposing her as an interloper.

Bound Volumes—Vols. II—XIII (May 1940—Dec. 1948) 15s. each post free, or 12s. 6d. each in sets of four or more consecutive volumes.

All communications should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.